

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**  
**(Docket No. 1769 formerly 1589a)**

<b>In re the Application of:</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Timothy Roscoe et al.</b>	)	
	)	<b>Group Art Unit 2134</b>
<b>Serial No.: 09/941,326</b>	)	
	)	<b>Examiner: Peter Poltorak</b>
<b>Confirmation No. 6834</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Filed: August 29, 2001</b>	)	
	)	
<b>For: METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR</b>	)	
<b>COMMUNICATION</b>	)	
<b>CONTROL IN A COMPUTING</b>	)	
<b>ENVIRONMENT</b>	)	

Mail Stop Issue Fee  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

**INTERVIEW SUMMARY AND COMMENTS REGARDING**  
**AN INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT**

Dear Sir:

Applicant submits the following interview summary for interviews held with the Examiner on October 12, 2006 and October 13, 2006, and comments regarding an Information Disclosure Statement.

**1. Interview Summary**

On October 12, 2006, the undersigned held a telephone interview with Examiner Poltorak. During the interview, we discussed the allowability of claims 1-21, 24, 26-28, 30-38, 42-45, and 54-55 and an Examiner's amendment to cancel claim 56. On October 13, 2006, the undersigned informed the Examiner that support for the amendment to the specification made in Applicant's response of August 13, 2006 is located in the specification at page 5, lines 3-6 and page 6, lines 8-13, and that Applicant approved of the Examiner's amendment cancelling claim 56 if the amendment would put the application in a condition for allowance.

**2. Information Disclosure Statement (IDS)**

Applicant desires confirmation that the Examiner has considered the references numbered 1-8 and 10-24 listed on the on the IDS submitted by Applicant on February 21, 2002 and received by the Patent Office on March 5, 2002. In the Office Action mailed June 6, 2005, the Examiner indicated that the Caronni et al. reference (reference #9 of the IDS submitted February 21, 2002) had been placed in the application file, but that the information referred to therein had not been considered as to the merits. The Examiner drew a line through reference #9. Applicant subsequently submitted another IDS citing the Caronni et al. reference, which the Examiner reviewed on October 19, 2005. Applicant believes that since the Examiner did not draw lines through any of the references numbered 1-8 and 10-24, the Examiner's initials and arrows drawn on the IDS submitted February 21, 2002 indicate that the Examiner has considered the references numbered 1-8 and 10-24. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner provide written notice to the Applicant if any of the references numbered 1-8 and 10-24 on the IDS submitted February 21, 2002 have not been considered by the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

**McDONNELL BOEHNEN  
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP**

Dated: NOVEMBER 3, 2006

By: David L. Ciesielski  
David L. Ciesielski  
Reg. No. 57,432